



William Simon
<wsimon@frontier.net>
11/10/2005 02:49 PM

To Sabrina Forrest/EPR/R8/USEPA/US@EPA
cc
bcc
Subject RE: CC48 and Gladstone treatment

The mine pool had reached above the predicted level and had been maintained for a long period before SGC was allowed to put in the 2nd bulkhead which by so doing isolated the pressure gauge off on the first bulkhead. The consent decree made this requirement so that they knew equilibrium had been reached. Of course wetter or dryer than normal years changes this somewhat. But equilibrium of the surrounding mountain and the hydrological drawdown cone from + 100 yrs of mining (actually only about 30 yrs. For the American tunnel intercept with the SG mine) likely did not get to equilibrium and it might not for many years.

Yes, I'll put it on the agenda and I'll ask Pete McKay to attend as well. Bill

-----Original Message-----

From: Forrest.Sabrina@epamail.epa.gov
[mailto:Forrest.Sabrina@epamail.epa.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, November 09, 2005 9:43 AM
To: William Simon
Subject: Re: CC48 and Gladstone treatment

Bill Thanks and thanks too for pointing out page 16 . I still have a question regarding the rationale behind considering the mine pool in equilibrium if we are seeing additional flows in other areas. Can you explain this to me and my simple mind?

ps - I was wrong about the CC18 location too - it is above the Herbert placer ponds and S Fork CC.

pps - Would you like to add Rose and Walsh Smelter to the agenda and invite Willie Tookey to the ARSG meeting? We could discuss our preliminary findings on the Rose and Walsh Smelter data and it would be useful for the ARSG (and County, if they are in attendance) to discuss possible plans or get ideas on how to address issues. I can at least tell folks what has been happening.

Sabrina Forrest
999 18th Street, Ste. 300
Mail Code: 8EPR-B
Denver, CO 80202-2466
ph: 303.312.6484
fax: 303.312.6955
E-mail: forrest.sabrina@epa.gov

William Simon
<wsimon@frontier.net>

11/07/2005 10:11 PM

Sabrina
Forrest/EPR/R8/USEPA/US@EPA

To

cc

Subject
CC48 and Gladstone treatment

The moving average graph at CC 48 depicts quite clearly what has happened since the consent decree was completed and SGC stopped treating. Actually Gold King was treating after that for a while, off and on, in 2003 but they were out of compliance even when they were operating apparently due to the change of conditions and addition of Gold King mine waters. Zn concentrations have increased substantially according to the 12 month moving average which tends to smooth things out rather than accentuate them.

Animas long, Page 16, has a time line explanation of events.

Our graphs for CC18 and CC20 only go through 2002 unfortunately but I've requested more recent USGS data and we'll be getting some from the TBA so that will help in the future- we'll add it to what we have and then will do similar to CC48.

Bill

(See attached file: CC48 Charts.xls) (See attached file: Animas Long.doc)